

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/118202>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

(Not) Narrating the History of the Federal Republic: Reflections on the Place of the New Left in the History and Historiography of the Federal Republic

Joachim C. Häberlen

The history of the Federal Republic of Germany seems to be a success story.¹ After the failed attempts to create a stable and enduring democracy in the revolutions of 1848 and during the Weimar Republic, after the more or less authoritarian regime of the Empire and the Nazi dictatorship, at first the western part of Germany and eventually Germany as a whole has turned into a stable and prosperous democracy. After the British referendum in June 2016 to leave the EU and the election of Donald Trump as president of the United States in November that year, German chancellor Angela Merkel has even been presented as a last defender of western liberalism.² It is indeed a remarkable transformation: from a country that seemed to be the very antithesis of *Western* democracy during the first half of the twentieth century to its bulwark. To be sure, scholars of Imperial and Weimar Germany have painted a much more nuanced picture by now, highlighting the democratic practices and potentials of these societies.³ Yet, this does not change the basic story: West Germany seems to be an example of successful democratization and liberalization that shines particularly bright in comparison with the years of instability and destruction in the first half of the twentieth century. It is, to use Hayden White's terminology, a "romance", a heroic story of overcoming evil powers for good.⁴

In recent years, scholars have also presented more cautionary narratives that critically question the heroic stories of the Federal Republic's democratic success. While not putting the viability of Germany's democratic institutions into doubt, they draw attention to more microscopic forms of power that do not come into sight by focusing on institutional or legal histories. Scholars, both historians and sociologists, working on questions of subjectivities have been most impressive in this regard.⁵ These scholars have explored the microscopic and often contradictory powers that guide individuals how to form their selves emotionally, mentally or bodily. While these "governments of subjectification" are not formulating explicit and strict rules that are to be followed, they nevertheless create a field of power that affects people. These studies offer much less of a clear narrative. Scholars working in the field frequently emphasize paradoxes, tensions and contradictions. If this literature follows a particular emplotment in Hayden White's sense, it is a satire: hopes that self-knowledge might lead to emancipation were disappointed, as the project of understanding the self only resulted in new forms of power. While there are opportunities for critique, always appearing in unexpected moments and always already in the process of waning, there is little hope that the struggle for emancipation might actually succeed in the end.⁶

The extra-parliamentary left of the 1960s and 1970s plays a crucial role in both narratives, though in different ways.⁷ On the one hand, scholars who present narratives of democratization debate whether the Federal Republic became a stable democracy because of, or despite of the student uprisings around 1968 and the subsequent wave of protests and terrorism, even though scholars of the early Federal Republic have pointed out that processes of cultural liberalization and political democratization were well underway before the student protests of the 1960s.⁸ On the other hand, scholars writing about subjectivities have repeatedly emphasized that the counter-cultural and alternative milieus of the 1960s

and 1970s played a crucial role for the development of an “entrepreneurial” or “creative-consumerist” self that characterizes the present. Values stressed in the alternative scene, such as emotionality or flexibility, have become central features of culturally hegemonic forms of subjectivity, scholars have argued.⁹ The irony is of course that the movements had started out to develop an alternative to capitalism, but ultimately only contributed to its transformation, making this indeed a satirical story in Hayden White’s sense.

My goal in this article is to develop an alternative perspective that differs with regards to its temporal structure. Writing history in a conventional narrative mode that most histories follow implies developing a plot with a particular temporal structure: there is a clear beginning of the story, a development and a finish with a resolution of the conflict – or the absence of such a resolution that indicates the futility of all struggles, in the case of a satire. The crucial point, however, is that there is a particular temporal arc to the story, which usually ends in the present moment, with a stable democracy or with a neoliberal regime of subjectivity. The perspectives I seek to develop do not follow this temporal structure and are, in this very specific sense, not narrative. This is, to be clear, not to argue that the accounts I present are any less constructed, and one might well find literary forms that might serve as role models for presentations of history that follow different temporal structures.

To make this case, I turn to the radical left from the mid 1970s to the early 1980s as a case study, though I hope that my reflections are of broader relevance.¹⁰ In a first step, I examine how scholars have narrated the history of the extra-parliamentary left and related it to more general narratives of the Federal Republic. The article then develops two distinct non-narrative perspectives. The second section proposes studying the alternative left as a space for experimentation. I am certainly not the first to note that alternative leftists celebrated

experimentation – culturally, sexually, spiritually, socially, and in other ways. However, I contend that we need to reflect on the narrative implications of taking this experimental aspect seriously. Leftists were engaged in multiple experiments, with multiple unforeseeable and unintended outcomes. To tell the story of the alternative left in terms of experimentation thus means that there is no more or less dramatic finish to the story; there is, to put it pointedly, no plot to tell. Finally, the article turns to the urban revolts of 1980/81, a topic that has received much less attention than protests around 1968. The article suggests understanding these revolts as momentous (rather than transformative) events for which the intensity of the moment mattered. The challenge is to grasp this intensity that cannot be embedded into a narrative structure.

The Extra-Parliamentary Left in West German Historiography

The left, and in particular the extra-parliamentary student left around 1968, has often been credited with a special role in the history of West Germany's democratization. According to sympathetic accounts, protesting students challenged and ultimately overcame the conservative and authoritarian mainstream of the early Federal Republic. Even though demands for a more radical form of democracy that would include the end of capitalism were not achieved, students' protests in the long run laid the foundations for a democratic political culture that was ingrained in everyday life and was not limited to institutions, the argument runs. Perhaps most famously, political scientist Claus Leggewie has claimed that the protests of 1968 amounted to a "re-founding" of the Federal Republic.¹¹ Even the experience of terrorism in the German Autumn of 1977 has been interpreted in such terms. Responding to terrorism, both conservatives, who came to realize that the democratic state

had the means to deal with such a threat, and the extra-parliamentary left that distanced itself from violence made peace with democracy, Karrin Hanshew has argued.¹² While this “romantic” narrative stresses the Federal Republic’s successful democratization, other equally sympathetic interpretations provide an, as it were, incomplete romantic account. They, too, highlight – and embrace – the radical democratic impetus of the protests, but are more reluctant with regards to the outcomes, as the radical potential of the student movement is not yet realized: at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Timothy Brown puts it pointedly, “1968 remains unfinished business in more than one ways.”¹³ The fight of “light over darkness” that characterizes a romance is still ongoing.¹⁴

Other scholars have looked at the extra-parliamentary left in less favorable terms. Still narrating West German history in “romantic” terms as a story of successful democratization, they have claimed that rather than strengthening the Federal Republic’s democratic culture, the protests of the 1960s and the terrorism of the 1970s endangered it. The Federal Republic became a stable democracy not because of, but despite of these protests.¹⁵ Somewhat in contrast to these sometimes highly politicized debates, recent scholarship has also questioned how big a role the protests played in liberalizing and democratizing West German (political) culture. “The rebels of 1968 stormed barricades that had been abandoned by their former defenders”, Philipp Gassert notes.¹⁶ At stake in these debates is thus the place of the extra-parliamentary left in the Federal Republic’s history; the master-narrative of this history, however, remains the same: it is a “heroic” story of a successful democratization.

But there are skeptical voices with regards to this master narrative. Scholars such as historian Nina Verheyen and linguist Joachim Scharloth have drawn attention to power relations in communicative forms that do not neatly fit into stories of democratization. In an insightful

book, Verheyen has sought to historicize narratives of democratization by examining West Germans' desire for discussing [*Diskussionslust*], which was conceived as a more democratic form of communication. But instead of taking this claim at face value and asking how the Federal Republic became a democratic society due to a new communicative culture, she has inquired how precisely Germans came to believe that they built a democratic society by communicating in a specific way. Not least, Verheyen has thus put the belief in discussing and the power of rational arguments popular in the student left of the 1960s into a historical perspective. And while Verheyen does see the merits in discussing, she is also keenly aware that discussions are, *pace* Habermas, no spaces free of power relations: often, those who could hold out longer won the supposedly rational debates.¹⁷ Focusing on less formal forms of communication, Joachim Scharloth has made a related argument. Students introduced, he claims, informal modes of communication into West German culture. These forms of communication – addressing each other with the informal *Du* and by first name, for example – seemed to be less hierarchical and above all not following the rules of bourgeois mores. But Scharloth is deeply skeptical about any claims that regard these new communicative styles as liberating. Indeed, informal communicative styles followed their own rules that could be as strict as formal ones.¹⁸ Both Scharloth and Verheyen thus express a certain skepticism vis-à-vis the success stories of democratization and liberalization. While they do not offer another master narrative, their accounts can be read as satires insofar as they deconstruct the utopian projects of democratic and power-free forms of communication: their mode of presentation is ironic, and there is not even the possibility of a victory of “light over darkness”.

We can also read critical accounts of contemporary regimes of subjectivity as satires, even though numerous authors stress that they are not writing in a narrative mode. According to sociologists such as Ulrich Bröckling and Andreas Reckwitz, individuals in the contemporary, neoliberal world are confronted with cultural scripts that instruct them how to shape their emotional, mental and bodily selves. These scholars have examined the models of subjectivity such scripts provide, emphasizing values such as autonomy, creativity and self-realization that are constitutive for the post-modern self.¹⁹ When these ideals first emerged, inter alia within the radical left and counter-cultures of the 1960s and 1970s, they were considered subversive and anti-capitalist, because they challenged and undermined the ideals of rationalist, industrial modernity. Leftists, that is, longed for personal autonomy that seemed to require conformity and homogeneity. Yet, what started off as an emancipatory program turned into a new, powerful regime of capitalism, these accounts suggest:

“Neoliberal political rationality does not govern *against* but *with* unfolded technologies of the self and thereby renders itself pleasurable. They always appear as technologies of freedom”, writes Sabine Maasen.²⁰ Such “satirical” narrative cast a doubtful light on any claim that there ever was a real chance for emancipation. Historian Sven Reichardt has made this argument most forcefully in his monumental monograph on the alternative left of the 1970s. He analyzes the alternative left as a regime of subjectification that required people to do certain things, such as talking about their feelings, to be recognized as “authentic”. His assessment is bleak: “Within the left-alternative milieu, people not only had the right to live self-realized [*selbstverwirklicht*], but also the duty to render account of themselves, and to convey these insights into the self to others. ... The self-therapeutization was intended as a project for the liberation of the alienated individual, but unfolded in the practice of the democratic panopticism a norming effect and became a management of the self.”²¹

These accounts of the extra-parliamentary and alternative left in the Federal Republic work, if often implicitly, with different emplotments. For a long time, the majority has functioned in a romantic mode, though there was no consensus on who represented “light” in the struggle over “darkness” (did the student left forge a more democratic Germany, or did it endanger the democratization of the Federal Republic?), nor was there consensus about the completion of these struggles. More recent scholarship offers an alternative by employing a satirical mode of emplotment. In this reading, the struggle for emancipation only led to new forms of self-disciplining, to a transformation of capitalism that could integrate and use the forces opposing it. Nowadays, creativity is no longer an authentic way of self-expression in an alienated, capitalist world, but a requirement to succeed in this world.²² What these accounts have in common is a narrative arc that ends, more or less, in the present, be it the present of a stable, westernized liberal democracy, or the present of a neoliberal regime of subjectivity. In what follows, I want to propose two alternatives that function differently with regards to their temporal structure. It is an attempt to think about the history of the Federal Republic, or, to be more precise, about episodes in this history without a vanishing point that structures any narrative.

Open Ends: Experiments in the Alternative Left

The alternative left of the 1970s was a diverse and complex phenomenon. Activists engaged in a variety of practices, ranging from consciousness-raising groups to reviving traditions of the life reform movement, from practicing yoga to practicing karate, from developing new forms of collective living to organizing independent youth clubs, from building self-managed companies to going on self-organized vacation trips. Emotions and bodies played a crucial

role for both the political thinking and the political practices of the left. According to leftist critics, urban capitalism had erected an emotional regime that allowed only for fear and boredom, that isolated people from each other, and that did not allow for the expression of feelings.²³ Capitalism, leftists argued, forced in particular men to appear as fearless and rational beings who would not show any sympathy or solidarity toward other men.²⁴ Facing this emotional plight, leftists developed a range of practices trying to produce feelings they felt were missing in modern, capitalist society. Focusing particularly on spatial aspects, I have suggested elsewhere to interpret these practices as “emotional experiments” that sometimes succeeded in producing feelings and sometimes failed. Speaking of “emotional experiments” emphasizes the constant process of trial and error in leftist attempts to overcome the emotional constraints of capitalism and to produce the feelings they desperately desired.²⁵ Building on this argument, my interest here is in what conceptualizing the alternative left as a space for experimentation implies in narrative terms.

At first sight, narrating an experiment, that is, the “trying out” of new emotional practices, might look like narrating any other story with regard to the temporal structure: there is a clear beginning of the experiment, and a clear ending. The experiment might succeed, in the sense that it yields the results those engaged in the experiment had hoped for, or it fails, because it does not yield such results. However, the temporal structure looks different if we analyze the alternative left as a *space for experimentation*. It is no longer about the outcome of the experiment, but about a series of repeated and reworked experiments with multiple outcomes; there is no story to tell with a meaningful end. Writing the history of the alternative left in terms of experimentation thus does not result in a new narrative for the Federal Republic. It is, rather, an attempt to regain a sense of the open-endedness of the situation.

The various consciousness-raising groups, called *Selbsterfahrungsgruppen* in German, provide an example for this kind of experimentation.²⁶ All over West German cities, women's, men's, gay and therapy groups emerged in the alternative scene. Participants joined them hoping to overcome the emotional constraints of masculinity under capitalism and to "strengthen feelings", as a man from Freiburg who looked for other men to form a group wrote.²⁷ In a group, members of a Munich based women's group noted in 1976, they would find an opportunity to "erase not only the wall between us and our bodies, but also the wall between us women".²⁸ Groups thus played a fundamental role in leftists' efforts to transform their selves.

These groups published numerous and detailed reports describing what happened at meetings, reflecting on members' feelings, conflicts and the impact the sessions had on life outside the group.²⁹ Mostly, members talked in these groups, about their childhood, relations with their parents and partners, husbands and wives, about feelings and sexuality, and not least about relations within the group. But often, just talking was not enough. "Verbal power does not create emotionality", a men's group from Heidelberg wrote.³⁰ Hence, groups also engaged in a variety of bodily practices. Men shared moments of physical intimacy while sleeping in the same bed or cuddling with each other, which did not imply any homosexuality, as they were eager to emphasize, while women famously observed and explored their bodies and particularly their vaginas in order to develop a more positive relation to themselves.³¹

Participating in a group was anything but a purely joyous activity. In many cases, accounts of groups detail the pressures members faced and the tremendous conflicts within groups. Members of a gay group in West Berlin for example noted that the permanent conversations

frustrated them and that they perpetuated power relations rather than finding a “mutual understanding”. Group members constantly yelled at each other, but did not access their “most inner emotional world.” In the end, they even worried that they might become suicidal.³² Meanwhile, the men’s group from Heidelberg highlighted the “general difficulty” that their “demand to let more out during conversations = being more open, resulted in performance and competition pressure.”³³ A seventeen year-old girl from West Berlin who had joined a women’s group organized by a young teacher had made a similar experience. “I’ve felt a group pressure, that is, everyone has to talk about herself, and that means that everyone has to have made certain experiences to be able to keep up in these conversations.”³⁴ In light of such accounts, Sven Reichardt summarizes: “What emerged was a almost pure culture of confession and avowal that resulted in primarily talking about one’s feelings and ‘subjective affection’ [*subjektive Betroffenheit* – a term difficult to translate, meaning roughly “being affected by something].”³⁵ Maik Tändler puts this argument more pointedly: “The therapeutic search for authenticity required the submission under a strict system of emotional rules.”³⁶ Such critical assessments imply a satirical narrative of attempts for self-liberation that only resulted in new and strict rules. The struggle for personal transformation and liberation proved futile.

There is much to be said for such a perspective. Yet, this emphasis on futile outcomes is not only one-sided, it also fails to account for the open and uncertain ends of the experiments of group activities. Consider the story of a women’s group from Munich. Already at conception and birth, women developed a “hostility against the body”, they claimed, that gynecologists and pharmaceutical industry later on only strengthened. This hostility had made it difficult for them to “feel and experience ourselves in a sensual way (with eyes, ears, noses, hands,

fingers, breasts, bellies, mouths, flanks, cheeks and lips of all kinds)". The women thus set out to recuperate bodies and feelings, to "re-include our body into our life (sensing – finding), and to consciously live (love) with it (us) in an emotional way." To this end, they wanted to understand their bodies and in particular their menstrual cycle. They started with measuring their temperature on a daily basis, but soon added some thirty criteria for self-observation, such as "feeling good or bad, dreamed, active, depressive, cried, thunder storm, thirsty, hungry, nervous, sad, and so on." In their initial euphoria, some women even started drawing an emotional curve and related it to their temperature curve. Yet, this excessive self-observation quickly became a burden for the women. In the hectic of everyday life, they forgot about measuring their temperature in the morning, and observing their emotional state on a daily basis could be highly depressing. "Every day hectic, depressive, sad, disrupted, relationship troubles. That's something we can only suppress." It is a bleak description, reminiscent of the "democratic panopticism" Reichardt describes that only produced normative effects. The attempt to develop a different relation with the body seems to have failed. But the women were well aware of the difficulties, and hence decided to lower the demands. They focused only on really important criteria, and summarized their emotional situation every couple of days. This seems to have worked, as they developed a more positive relationship towards menstruation. While they previously thought about the bad smell or sickness, they now felt that it was "pleasant, despite the pain and psychic instability, to feel, to experience his, I mean of course her, that is, my period."³⁷

The group was not alone in modifying their practices in response to frustrations. A man named Lothar, who had participated in a men's group in Munich, noted a feeling of "paralysis" after the first sessions. "I felt that we didn't talk with each other, but about each other." After "tenacious discussions", the group decided to "work through their relations",

which caused two “big theoreticians” to leave the group, as they were afraid of showing their feelings, Lothar claimed. For those who remained in the group, it was rewarding. Lothar at least was happy that he was able “to leave the ways of understanding and rationalizing”, and could just express whatever was bothering him “without any censorship”. When he cried in front of the group, the others first reacted helplessly, but then came and fondled and hugged him. “It was the first time that I allowed other men to do this, without consciously rejecting them”, he wrote. Ultimately, he had been able to develop a “new identity as a man” that included showing “feelings of sympathy, tenderness, vulnerability, jealousy, but also directly expressed rage and aggression” vis-à-vis other men.³⁸ Even the group from Heidelberg that had been so full of conflict continued, though we do not know how their journey went on.

These accounts suggest that joining consciousness-raising groups could result in personal transformations that participants experienced as uplifting. Emphasizing these experiences, however, is not to argue for a more positive, as it were romantic, version of the story of successful self-liberation. It is not to argue for a more balanced account that includes both positive, that is liberating, and negative, that is restricting, effects either. Rather, my point here is to change the perspective and not to understand the experience in groups from the vanishing point of self-liberation or self-imposed norms, but to look at them as continuously evolving experiments, as a process of trial and error in which activists produced a variety of feelings, ranging from frustration to enthusiasm. Approaching groups as experiments may thus highlight the immense emotional productivity of groups. It is also an attempt to develop a perspective that breaks with the temporal structure of our conventional narratives.

A similar argument can be made with regard to the body politics of the alternative left.³⁹

Much of the literature on bodies in the new left has focused on sexuality and the

(problematic) attempts to develop different and more liberal forms of sexuality.⁴⁰ But leftist body politics were not limited to sexuality. They developed both a more general critique of the bodily regime of capitalism, and practices that sought to disrupt this regime. According to leftist writers, capitalism fragmented bodies, as specific tasks required only specific parts of the body, genitalia (and only them) for sex, thumbs and fingers (and only them) for work. Writing for *Autonomie*, one of the most important theoretical magazines for the new left, Matthias Beltz for example argued that “the existence of this factory society destroys [zerstört] human beings into parts of the machine, into head, stomach and sex.”⁴¹ As Manne, the main character of Gerd-Gustl Müller’s left-wing youth novel *Der Job* described his boring work: “Even a brain amputee could do this job. Arse, stomach, noggin, cock, and feet – none of that was necessary. Ready to be amputated. All you needed was your thumb and two fingers.”⁴² Children, who were naturally able to enjoy their bodily feelings, otherwise unknown author Lucy Körner argued in *Ulcus Molle*, had to oppress those feelings lest they faced their parents’ disapproval. As a result, children stopped “living their natural joy of life” and began to “cramp”, Körner posited.⁴³ Given this plight, leftists sought to develop a range of practices that would allow them to feel their bodies in an intense and wholesome way. These practices included forms of sexuality that did not focus on genitalia, but also practicing yoga or karate, or excessive dancing.⁴⁴ We can analyze these practices as bodily experiments that in some instances succeeded in producing the feelings of intensity leftists longed for, but failed in others.

Reports about a “Leisure-Time Alternative for Communes” that took place in Kamp-Lintfort near Duisburg in the summer of 1976 and that attracted about one hundred leftists offer an example.⁴⁵ They were by no means unanimously positive, some stressing conflicts

and frustration, others joyous moments. Some attendees preferred to express feelings, including aggressions, in a very direct manner, while others expressed thoughts in a more rational way. Frequently, those who could talk most loudly simply dominated discussions. But there were also more positive aspects. It was, as one participant put it, a “chamber for experimentation”, where people lived “intensely”, which included doing both “damaged” and “beautiful” things. Bodily activities played a crucial role for this intensity. People went for a collective swim in a nearby lake, danced around nakedly in the rain, and painted their backs sitting in a huge circle. The collective outhouse was a challenge for some, while others enjoyed the communication there. These activities created, as one attendee put it, “beautiful moments where competition and performance pressure [*Leistungskeisten*], fear disappeared, where we felt free to be as we really are and did not have to be as we think others expect us to be.”⁴⁶ At least for brief moments, the experiments seem to have yielded what participants had longed for: feelings of freedom, free of fear and competition that, in their mind, dominated the capitalist world.

The emphasis on peculiar moments of intensity that is typical for many texts describing bodily experiences is noteworthy regarding questions of narration. For leftist activists, it was not, or at least not primarily, the ultimate and lasting outcome of struggles that mattered, but the production of fleeting moments of intensity. Sometimes, leftists succeeded in creating such intense moments, in other situations they failed. Women from Göttingen for example complained about “slow gooey music” at a women’s only party that made them dance stereotypically in a “cutely female, gracefully, charming” way, but kept them from letting out their “energies (and aggressions)”.⁴⁷ Writing about these (successful or failed) attempts to produce brief moments of intensity does not work in narrative mode. Narratives, as Hayden

White has described them, require a plot with a more or less clearly defined finale that structures the story. Exceptional moments of intensity do not constitute such a finale; there is no end of the story. They are, as it were, only fleeting sparks. Writing the history of such moments therefore does not result in a new narrative, but in an attempt to write history in a different, non-narrative mode, as the following discussion of the urban revolts of 1980/81 elaborates.

Intense Moments: The Revolts of 1980/81

In the spring of 1980, something unexpected happened. In various cities in West Germany and in neighboring countries such as Switzerland and the Netherlands, youth riots erupted. In Amsterdam, squatters engaged in massive street battles with the police during the spring of 1980.⁴⁸ In Germany, riots first erupted in Bremen on 6 May 1980, when a demonstration against a military recruitment ceremony ended with massive battles between protestors and the police. Next followed Zurich in Switzerland, where a protest against the municipal policy to subsidize the local opera but not to give in to demands for an Autonomous Youth Center resulted in two nights of rioting on 30 and 31 May 1980.⁴⁹ In June, the police evicted the occupants of the Dreisameck in Freiburg, which again led to violent protests.⁵⁰ It took a while until the West Berlin scene joined the wave of revolts, but when it finally happened in December 1980, the revolt was more intense, more violent and longer lasting than in any other place. For participants, it was a time of “euphoric feelings of happiness”, as former activists from West Berlin put it.⁵¹ For the purpose of this essay, these revolts are interesting because of the discussions about the temporality of politics within the movement, and the implications they have for conceptualizing the revolts as a non-transformative event.⁵² For

protestors, only the radical and exuberant moment mattered, not the future. The goal is thus not to inquire about historical origins of such ideas, or the lasting impact they had, or to contextualize such ideas in a post-modern moment – no doubt, legitimate questions. Instead, I seek to grasp the production of momentous and exuberant intensity during the revolts.

Temporality played a fundamental role for activists' politics.⁵³ Writing in the West Berlin magazine *radikal*, a group of activists challenged a conventional temporal understanding of revolution: "For them [that is, for communist *K-Gruppen*-leftists they criticized], revolution is a fixed point, and beyond this, the realm of freedom is supposedly there; this idea is nothing but a consolation with a distant paradise, but we live here, now and today. Perhaps freedom is only the brief moment, from the point when the cobblestone is picked up until it hits, that is, the moment of change, of transgression, of movement."⁵⁴ Scholars have repeatedly quoted this and similar phrases to discuss how protestors legitimized and romanticized violence.⁵⁵ Yet, it is worth thinking about the temporality of politics the statement implies. According to a traditional understanding of politics, a revolution would divide time in a before and after; the revolution would be an event, clearly marked in time, that transformed everything, from the state of bondage to the state of freedom. Imagining such a revolution in the future was, so to speak, telling the history of a (future and potential) revolution with a "romantic" plot, as a struggle for liberation that would ultimately be successful. The anonymous authors, however, developed a rather different understanding of freedom and, by implication, of politics. What came *after* the moment of change did not matter; only the brief moments of transgression and movement were important. There is no grand finale to this story of revolution, only (perhaps repeatable, but this was a problematic issue) acts of transgression.

The anonymous authors were not alone in developing a different temporal understanding of politics. An activist writing as K. Ätzer for *radikal* described the riots during the visits of American president Ronald Reagan in West Berlin in June 1982, stressing the exuberance of the moment. Though there had been worries within the scene that the protests and riots against Reagan might be utterly ritualized and thus not creating a sense of transgression, at least this author disagreed retrospectively: there was action, and “holy fuck, what an action!”. It did not matter where, “our rags weightlessly fly over the borders of order, the law is in flames. The moments in which I succeed in jumping out of the constraints of the usual impotence resemble each other: no matter whether it’s 12 December, Goltz-Street, Haig [all moments of other riots] or another occasion – the feeling is the same.”⁵⁶ The excitement the author described resonates with what Tomas Lecorte wrote in an autobiographical account of his experiences as a “street fighter” during the riots in the spring of 1981: “Why would I care for risk and strategy, gains or material damages given this feeling that the armored power is at the whim of my ridiculous stones! It should go on like this forever. It was better than any revolution.”⁵⁷ For these activists, it was not the outcome that mattered, but the intensity of the moment. Indeed, the very sense of time changed during the revolt. The “movement”, another anonymous author for *radikal* had written in February 1982, had been an “eruption” that had made “time, clotted into an unbearable duration” explode.⁵⁸ Inquiring about the (long-term) effects of the protest movements, whether and how they contributed, for example, to changing political cultures or urban developments, would thus mean employing a *temporal* perspective that is at odds with what mattered for activists.

The Dutch activist group *Agentur Bihwet* theorized this understanding of the revolts as a peculiar event in time most thoroughly.⁵⁹ And while they were writing about the squatters’

movement in Amsterdam in 1980, their reflections also speak to the situation in West Berlin, as the editors of the German edition pointed out.⁶⁰ *Agentur Bilwet* conceptualized a crucial moment of rioting (in Amsterdam, it was a riot on 3 July 1980, in Berlin, riots on 12 December 1980 might be considered an equivalent) as an event that “emancipated itself from the actors.” In the event, the group argued, “the usual tree diagram of cause and effect is replaced by a carrousel of causalities of episodes and stories, in which cause and effect seem to be replaceable. [...] [The event] is local, unique, ecstatic. In the event, a condensation of time takes place. It is of an intensity that lets past and future rescind into nothingness. It is the intrusion of the present into the stubborn progress of history.”⁶¹ According to *Agentur Bilwet*, riots, or at least particular riots, were moments of exuberant transgression from “culture” into “wilderness”.⁶² But such events were by necessity unique; they could not be repeated. Trying to turn an event into a movement that lasted de-intensified time. The perspective on time *Agentur Bilwet* developed here clashes with historians’ usual understanding of time as a “sequence of actions” who unfold their meaning and consequences in complex contexts.⁶³ Following the lead the writings of *Agentur Bilwet* imply calls for grasping the intensity of the moment.

Intense events did not simply happen. They were imaginatively anticipated by leftist authors in the late 1970s who had theorized ecstatic moments of transgression, thereby developing an understanding of politics that emphasized playfulness and irrationality. Groups such as the *Subrealists*, a name reminiscent of the Surrealists of the 1920s, from Hamburg had celebrated the “revolutionary play of desire” that would be a never-ending “discovery and adventure.”⁶⁴ Meanwhile, Munich based author and publisher Herbert Röttgen described festivities in his widely read book *Vulkantänze* as moments when “groups, genders and

classes that live separately in everyday life establish numerous ties, interweave and interlock, until the state of voluptuousness of communion, of homosexuality, of incest. All and any compulsiveness and efficiency thinking is melted away in a foaming and vibrating mixing pot.” For Röttgen, only these exuberant festivities could spark revolutionary flames. “All great rebellions were less strategy, tactics, agitation, organization – they were above all a mass feast, a ball of the devil that made all normalcies dance, a cornucopia of feelings.”⁶⁵

Historical development, an issue that had been of central importance for traditional Marxist leftwing politics, ceased to matter in the face of timeless feelings. As another Munich author named Rädli put it in December 1977: “Long live the body of humankind and of earth, since it eludes the merciless machinery of history. Wishes are timeless, feeling has no history. If society stands at the abyss, only dancing against the grain of time will help.”⁶⁶ Such texts created an imaginative knowledge of what would happen during intense moments, and how they would feel like. Radical activists knew what to expect and what to hope for in such situations.

Yet, and this is the paradox, such moments were unpredictable and had to happen unexpectedly. The riots in West Berlin on 12 December 1980, a date that became legendary within the movement, may serve as an example.⁶⁷ That day, rumors (that turned out to be false) had spread that the police had evicted squatters at Fraenkelufer in Kreuzberg. To protest against these evictions, activists formed a spontaneous demonstration that marched to nearby Kottbusser Tor, where heavy clashes with the police ensued that had, at first, to retreat. A man named Jürgen described what happened for the newly found leftwing daily *taž*. When he had first heard about what was going on, he was in disbelief. After years of a rather inactive leftwing movement, a riot in which protestors even seemed to prevail was unimaginable for him. Still, he went to Kottbusser Tor to see what was happening. Once he

was there, it rapidly dawned on him that “this time, the powder keg had really exploded. The long pent-up aggression, the result of a permanent meandering between threats and negotiations, the daily pinpricks have created a situation that nobody can control.” What he saw pushed him into a “different reality. A feeling of euphoria spreads, collectivization is well under way. ... This night in Kreuzberg, the social relations [*die Verhältnisse*] are turned from their head to feet. The streets are full of people, barricades are being built, time and again groups of people discussing with another.”⁶⁸ It was a sense of exuberant intensity authors such as Röttgen or Rädli had imaginatively anticipated. When the riot happened, it happened unexpectedly. Unlike a happening, a riot could not simply be staged. But the sense of timeless exuberance was well expected.

While these texts certainly suggest that at least some activists enjoyed the rioting, interpreting this merely as a celebration of violence is shortsighted. For once, it was a peculiar form of violence they celebrated, a confrontation with an opponent who was usually by far superior. Moments of victory were usually brief. Being interviewed by the news magazine *Der Spiegel*, a seventeen year-old boy who went by the name of Keule (club) explained that he had a “feeling of freedom” when he saw the police running away, even if it was only freedom for fifteen minutes. What happened after these fifteen minutes was not important, another man named Artur added, because what mattered was that “you are, for once, free of fear.”⁶⁹ A somewhat aestheticized account of the riots during the visit of American Secretary of State Alexander Haig in June 1982 by the “fighters of the erupting Sado-Marxist International” outlined what created the sense of excitement and exuberance:

The crowd soon broke through the barriers to kill time for some eight hours with some stones and joyous fires, and without any chiefs or prior agreements, [...].

Beyond any categorical belonging, the proletarianized met during this game with fire. ... The vandals created a zone that was partially liberated of any control, of any power and law, where encounters could develop, complicities, multifarious games against a world that controls all wishes and redirects them into production and consumption. The pleasure just to be there, to militantly and passionately re-conquer a space and time that escaped at this moment from any political or other maneuver.⁷⁰

This was not simply a celebration of violence. During the riot, the established order was dispended, for a brief moment at least. Unforeseen encounters became possible, and wishes and games rather than the usual and predictable rationality mattered. It was, as one rioter from Frankfurt put it, possible to be “unreasonable” during the riot.⁷¹ However, this also implied that planned violence, including riots, could not produce such a sense of intensity. Indeed, when riots were ritualized, they ceased being attractive, and more clandestine forms of (violent) activism that started to replace riots never yielded similar feelings.⁷²

Such feelings of intense exuberance were not limited to riots, even though these constituted moments of particular intensification. The entire spring and summer of 1981 was a period of “intoxication” [*Rausch*], as a former squatter told me. Squatters enjoyed life in their squats, spent the day sun bathing on rooftops, or danced during improvised punk concerts.⁷³ An article in the leftist magazine *Traumstadt*, dating most likely from early summer 1981, provides a glimpse into leftwing everyday life in West Berlin. Usually, the unnamed (presumably male) author got up late, between 11am and 12:30pm, if he bothered checking the time at all. He spent the day with a “dear woman” strolling through a park, a place of “ordered wilderness” where one could “forget oneself”, but where it was also easier to exchange looks with others and get into contact. He went to a demonstration, but the

political purpose did not matter; it was simply a place to meet friends, to invent absurd slogans, and to turn it into a “joyful urban walk” [*lustbetonter Stadtpaziergang*].⁷⁴ Life in West Berlin during the summer of 1981 – though, tellingly, the article does not explicate the exact time it refers to – was characterized by a sense of timelessness, a lack of structure, of political purpose; only playful desires mattered; engaging in serious politics, or even reading about political movements, was, by contrast, simply boring.

The revolts of 1980/81 – lasting in West Berlin, roughly speaking, from December 1980 to September 1981 – were a moment that stood out in time, these accounts suggest. They were a peculiar event, however, not because of their transformative quality, but because they created a distinct sense of intensity that set the revolt apart from “normal” times (and of course, this applied only to activists, not to authorities).⁷⁵ It would surely be worthwhile to situate this celebration of momentous exuberance in a broader post-structuralist moment. It is indeed not by accident that activists cited Michel Foucault’s claim that revolts resemble fireworks, shot into the sky to disappear immediately.⁷⁶ Yet, I have consciously opted against asking such contextualizing questions. My interest here has been in grasping the intensity of the moment, and in understanding how the event was dis-embedded from a temporal narrative of causes and effects. The challenge is, in other words, to write the history of a moment and its production, rather than to develop a new historical narrative that asks about beginnings and endings, causes and effects.

Conclusion

This special issue has set out to explore “new narratives” for the Federal Republic. There are, no doubt, good reasons to tell narratives, old or new, of the Federal Republic. In times of growing skepticism vis-à-vis democracy and European integration, “romantic” narratives of democratization and Westernization might help legitimize the democratic order and the European project. On the other hand, “satirical” narratives that question stories of liberalization might help us to also develop a critical perspective on the present. In this article, I have, however, not attempted to develop an alternative narrative. Rather, I have proposed an alternative perspective that does not adhere to the temporal structure of conventional narratives. This is, importantly, not to dismiss narratives completely. The perspectives I have to offer should be seen as supplements that might address blind spots rather than as replacements of narratives.

Narrating the history of the Federal Republic requires embedding events and developments into a (temporal) story that is structured by one or several vanishing points. My goal here has been to dis-embed events, as it were, by studying practices in the alternative left as experiments and by seeking the extraordinary emotional intensity during the revolts of 1980/81. Conceptually, the focus on experiments and moments is meant to shift attention away from outcomes and to develop a sense for the range of possibilities that actors explored in a process of trial-and-error. Of course, historians of the Weimar Republic have for a long time argued for looking at Weimar as a “laboratory” of modernity, rather than a prelude for Nazism.⁷⁷ It might be worthwhile to think about the Federal Republic, and perhaps particularly the 1970s, in a similar way as a laboratory of “post-modernity”, and not as a pre-history of the present.⁷⁸ After all, the dissolution of master narratives is the very signature of post-modernity. In that sense (to end on an ironic note), writing about the

history of the Federal Republic in a non-narrative way might itself be part and parcel of a post-modern narrative.

¹ See most importantly Edgar Wolfrum, *Die geglückte Demokratie: Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2006). See also, with a slightly more critical tone and further references, Andreas Rödter, “Das ‘Modell Deutschland’ zwischen Erfolgsgeschichte und Verfallsdiagnose,” *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 54 (2006), 345-363.

² Alison Smale and Steven Erlanger, “As Obama Exits World Stage, Angela Merkel May Be the Liberal West’s Last Defender,” *New York Times*, 12 November 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/13/world/europe/germany-merkel-trump-election.html>, retrieved 10 March 2018.

³ See only Margret Lavinia Anderson, *Practicing Democracy. Elections and Political Culture in Imperial Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), Kathleen Canning, Kerstin Barndt, and Kristin McGuire, eds., *Weimar Publics / Weimar Subjects. Rethinking the Political Culture of Germany in the 1920s* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), Peter Fritzsche, “Did Weimar Fail?,” *Journal of Modern History* 68 (1996), 629-656.

⁴ Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973), 8-9. For an excellent historical study making use of Hayden White’s reflections, see James Krapfl, *Revolution with a Human Face: Politics, Culture, and Community in Czechoslovakia, 1989-1992* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013).

⁵ See only Andreas Reckwitz, *Das hybride Subjekt: eine Theorie der Subjektkulturen von der bürgerlichen Moderne zur Postmoderne* (Weilerswist: Velbrück, 2006), Ulrich Bröckling, *Das*

unternehmerische Selbst: Soziologie einer Subjektivierungsform (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2007),

Pascal Eitler and Jens Elberfeld, eds., *Zeitgeschichte des Selbst: Therapeutisierung - Politisierung - Emotionalisierung* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2015).

⁶ See the sophisticated remarks on the fleeting possibilities of critique in Bröckling, *Unternehmerische Selbst*, 283-297.

⁷ The literature on “1968” is more than vast, see only Carola Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker, eds., *1968: The World Transformed* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), Norbert Frei, *1968: Jugendrevolte und globaler Protest* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag, 2008), Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey, ed., *1968 - Vom Ereignis zum Gegenstand der Geschichtswissenschaft, Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Sonderheft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998). For recent discussions of the historiography, see Quinn Slobodian, *Foreign Front: Third World Politics in Sixties West Germany* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012), Alex Vasudevan, *Metropolitan Preoccupations: The Spatial Politics of Squatting in Berlin* (Chichester: Wiley and Sons, 2016), 7-12.

⁸ See the discussion in Joachim Scharloth, *1968: Eine Kommunikationsgeschichte* (Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2011), 14-20. For liberalization prior to 1968, see Ulrich Herbert, ed., *Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland: Belastung, Integration, Liberalisierung 1945-1980* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2002).

⁹ See Bröckling, *Unternehmerische Selbst*, 257-260, Reckwitz, *Hybride Subject*, 441-499. For a related argument on France, see Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2005).

¹⁰ For a fuller discussion of the argument, see my book *The Emotional Politics of the Alternative Left: West Germany, 1968-1984* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

¹¹ Claus Leggewie, “1968 ist Geschichte,” *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* B 22-23 (2001), 3-6.

Similarly Edgar Wolfrum, “‘1968’ in der gegenwärtigen deutschen Geschichtspolitik,” *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* B 22-23 (2001): 33, Detlef Siegfried, “Auf dem Weg zu einer zivilen Kultur: Die Westdeutschen zwischen Traditionalismus und ‘Erlebnisgesellschaft,’” in *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik: Daten und Diskussionen*, ed. Eckart Conze and Gabriele Metzler (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999), 259.

¹² Karrin Hanshew, *Terror and Democracy in West Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), idem, “‘Sympathy for the Devil?’ The West German Left and the Challenge of Terrorism,” *Contemporary European History* 21 (2012), 511-532.

¹³ Timothy S. Brown, *West Germany and the Global Sixties: The Antiauthoritarian Revolt, 1962-1978* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 371. For a similar perspective, though not limited to West Germany, see Gerd-Rainer Horn, *The Spirit of '68: Rebellion in Western Europe and North America, 1956-1976* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

¹⁴ White, *Metahistory*, 9.

¹⁵ Kurt Sontheimer, *So war Deutschland nie: Anmerkungen zur politischen Kultur der Bundesrepublik* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1999), 102, Götz Aly, *Unser Kampf: 1968 - Ein irritierter Blick zurück* (Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer, 2008).

¹⁶ Philipp Gassert, “Narratives of Democratization: 1968 in Postwar Europe,” in *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1956-1977*, ed. Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 315.

¹⁷ Nina Verheyen, *Diskussionslust: Eine Kulturgeschichte des “besseren Arguments” in Westdeutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010).

¹⁸ Scharloth, *1968*.

¹⁹ Bröckling, *Unternehmerische Selbst*, Reckwitz, *Hybride Subject*. See also, with further references, Eitler and Elberfeld, eds., *Zeitgeschichte*, Sabine Maasen et al., eds., *Das beratene Selbst: Zur Genealogie der Therapeutisierung in den "langen" Siebzigern* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2011), Maik Tändler, *Das therapeutische Jahrzehnt: Der Psychoboom in den siebziger Jahren* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2016).

²⁰ Sabine Maasen, "Das beratene Selbst: Zur Genealogie der Therapeutisierung in den 'langen' Siebzigern: Eine Perspektivierung," in *Das beratene Selbst: Zur Genealogie der Therapeutisierung in den "langen" Siebzigern*, ed. Sabine Maasen, et al. (Bielefeld: transcript, 2011), 9.

²¹ Sven Reichardt, *Authentizität und Gemeinschaft: Linksalternatives Leben in den siebziger und frühen achtziger Jahren* (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2014), 67-71. For further critiques of the liberalization paradigm along such Foucauldian lines, see Jens Elberfeld, "Subjekt/Beziehung: Patriarchat - Partnerschaft - Projekt: Psychowissen und Normalisierungspraktiken im Diskurs der Paartherapie (BRD 1960-1990)," in *Das Selbst zwischen Anpassung und Befreiung: Psychowissen und Politik im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Uffa Jensen and Maik Tändler (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012), 113-114, idem, "Befreiung des Subjekts, Management des Selbst: Therapeutisierungsprozesse im deutschsprachigen Raum seit den 1960er Jahren," in *Zeitgeschichte des Selbst: Therapeutisierung - Politisierung - Emotionalisierung*, ed. Pascal Eitler and Jens Elberfeld (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2015), 81-82, Marcel Streng, "Führungsverhältnisse im Hungerstreik: Ein Kapitel zur Geschichte des westdeutschen Strafvollzugs (1973-1985)," in *Zeitgeschichte des Selbst: Therapeutisierung - Politisierung - Emotionalisierung*, ed. Pascal Eitler and Jens Elberfeld (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2015), 145.

²² See Boltanski and Chiapello, *Spirit*.

²³ See for example Detlef Hartmann, “Stadtknast – Knaststadt,” *Große Freiheit* 43, March 1981, 10-13, Ingolf Bonset, “Die Einsamkeit in den Städten,” *Das Blatt* 84, 24 December 1976 - 13 January 1977, 22-23. On critiques of modern urbanity, see also Christiane Reinecke, “Am Rande der Gesellschaft? Das Märkische Viertel – eine West-Berliner Großsiedlung und ihre Darstellung als urbane Problemzone,” *Zeithistorische Forschungen* 11 (2014), 212-234, Vasudevan, *Metropolitan Preoccupations*.

²⁴ See for example Männergruppe Frankfurt, “Tod dem Patriarschismus [sic]: Es lebe der Mann!,” *diskus* 3, November 1975, 26-28, Anon., “Ein Mann und sein Profil (Cartoon),” *Mannsbild* 1976, 26. On fear, see also Frank Biess, “Die Sensibilisierung des Subjekts: Angst und ‘neue Subjektivität’ in den 1970er Jahren,” *WerkstattGeschichte* 49 (2008), 51-72.

²⁵ See Joachim C. Häberlen and Maik Tändler, “Spaces for Feeling Differently: Emotional Experiments in the Alternative Left in West Germany During the 1970s,” *Emotion, Space and Society* 25 (2017), 103-110.

²⁶ On groups, see Maik Tändler, “Therapeutische Vergemeinschaftung: Demokratie, Emanzipation und Emotionalisierung in der ‘Gruppe’, 1963-1976,” in *Das Selbst zwischen Anpassung und Befreiung: Psychowissen und Politik im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Maik Tändler and Uffa Jensen (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012), 141-169.

²⁷ Martin Defren, “Männer-Gruppen in Freiburg, gibt’s die?,” *Stadtzeitung für Freiburg* 53, December 1980, 37. On men’s groups, see Helmut Rödner, *Männergruppen: Versuche einer Veränderung der traditionellen Männerrolle. Ursachen, Wege, Schwierigkeiten* (Berlin: Editora Queimada, 1978), Autorengruppe, *Männerbilder: Geschichten und Protokolle von Männern* (Munich: Trikont Verlag, 1976), Till Kadritzke, “Bewegte Männer. Men’s Liberation und Autonome Männergruppen in den USA und Deutschland, 1970-1995,” in *Feminismus in historischer*

Perspektive. Eine Reaktualisierung, ed. Feminismus Seminar (Bielefeld: transcript, 2014), 221-251.

²⁸ “Körperbewusstsein: Erfahrungen einer Selbsthilfe-Gruppe,” *Frauenjahrbuch* 1976, 135-151.

See also the translated text by a women group from Sweden, “Was sollen Männer in Frauengruppen,” *Hundert Blumen* 5 [n.d., probably early 1973], 7.

²⁹ Such reports were frequently published in leftwing magazines such as *Das Blatt* (Munich), *Carlo Sponti* (Heidelberg), or gay publications such as *Schwuchtel*, or publications by men’s groups such as *Mannsbild* (West Berlin).

³⁰ Die verbliebenen fünf aus der Männergruppe, “Männer – ohne Männlichkeit ratlos?,” *Carlo Sponti* 20/21, May 1976, 8-9.

³¹ On men, see for example Manfred et al., “Hickhack,” *Mannsbild*, 1976, 5-9, on women, see for example Alice Schwarzer, “Die neuen Hexen,” *EMMA* (May, 1977), 6, “Körperbewusstsein: Erfahrungen einer Selbsthilfe-Gruppe,” *Frauenjahrbuch* 1976, 135-151: 144-145. See also Jane Freeland, “Women’s Bodies and Feminist Subjectivities in West Germany,” in *The Politics of Authentic Subjectivity: Countercultures and Radical Movements Across the Iron Curtain, 1968-1989*, ed. Joachim C. Häberlen, Mark Keck-Szajbel and Kate Mahoney (New York: Berghahn, 2018), 131-150.

³² Anon., “SE-Panik,” *HAW Info* 21, March / April 1976, 15-56.

³³ Die verbliebenen fünf aus der Männergruppe, “Männer – ohne Männlichkeit ratlos?”

³⁴ Ulla/Birgit/Susan/Sabine/Barbara, “‘Ich möchte lernen, ich selbst zu sein.’

Siebzehnjährige Oberschülerinnen schreiben über sich,” *Kursbuch* 47, March 1977, 152.

³⁵ Reichardt, *Authentizität*, 705.

³⁶ Tändler, *Therapeutische Jahrzehnt*, 349. Tändler adds, however, that the “subcultural pluralization” of possible emotional expressions also led to a generally less strict emotional regime of West German society as a whole.

³⁷ ‘Körperbewusstsein’, 140-142.

³⁸ Lothar, “Ich freue mich, angefangen zu haben...,” *Das Blatt* 60, 19 December 1975 – 8 January 1976, 11-12.

³⁹ On bodies, see Reichardt, *Authentizität*, 629-720.

⁴⁰ See only Dagmar Herzog, *Sex after Fascism: Memory and Morality in Twentieth-Century Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), Brown, *West Germany*, Chapter 7, Peter-Paul Bänziger et al., eds., *Sexuelle Revolution? Zur Geschichte der Sexualität im deutschsprachigen Raum seit den 1960er Jahren* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2015), Joachim C. Häberlen, “Feeling Like a Child: Visions and Practices of Sexuality in the West German Alternative Left during the Long 1970s,” *Journal for the History of Sexuality* 25 (2016), 219-245.

⁴¹ Matthias Beltz, “Abenteuer aus der Fabrik: Geschichten aus der Beziehung zwischen Linksradikalen und Arbeiterbewegung,” *Autonomie: Materialien gegen die Fabrikgesellschaft* 9, October 1977, 17.

⁴² Gerd-Gustl Müller, *Der Job: Roman* (Munich: Weismann Verlag, 1977), 74.

⁴³ Lucy Körner, “Bioenergetik,” *Ulus Molle* 9/10, 1979, 21-23.

⁴⁴ See for example Eva Goldmund, “Nachwuchs,” *Frankfurter Frauenblatt*, September 1980, 22, Anon., “Karate,” *Lesbenpresse* 2, June 1975, 6.

⁴⁵ Anon., “FAK ’76,” *Info BUG* 129, 24 October 1976, 2; Anon., “FAK ’76, Teil II,” *Info BUG* 130, 1 November 1976, 3-4. See also Thommi, “FAK ’76: Freizeitalternative für

Kommunen,” and Elisabeth, “10 Tage Alternativismus FAK ’76: Liebe – Freude – Shit – u. Freiheit,” both *Carlo Sponti* 22/23, October 1976, 15-16.

⁴⁶ Anon., “FAK ’76, Teil II.”

⁴⁷ Anon., “Bericht über das nationale Frauenhaustreffen,” *Frauenzeitung* 2, December 1977, 17-23.

⁴⁸ On the revolts of 1980/81, see Bart van der Steen and Knud Andresen, eds., *A European Youth Revolt: European Perspectives on Youth Protest and Social Movements in the 1980s* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), Reichardt, *Authentizität*, 516-571, Freia Anders, “Wohnraum, Freiraum, Widerstand: Die Formierung der Autonomen in den Konflikten um Hausbesetzungen Anfang der achtziger Jahre,” in *Das alternative Milieu. Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa, 1968-1983*, ed. Sven Reichardt and Detlef Siegfried (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2010), 473-498, Hanno Balz and Jan-Henrik Friedrichs, eds., “*All we ever wanted ...*: eine Kulturgeschichte europäischer Protestbewegungen der 1980er Jahre (Berlin: Dietz, 2012), Vasudevan, *Metropolitan Preoccupations*, 86-132, Andreas Suttner, “*Beton brennt*: Hausbesetzer und Selbstverwaltung im Berlin, Wien und Zürich der 80er (Vienna: Lit-Verlag, 2011), Sebastian Haumann, “*Schade, daß Beton nicht brennt...*” *Planung, Partizipation und Protest in Philadelphia und Köln, 1940-1990* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2011), Georgy Katsiaficas, *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life* (Oakland: AK Press, 2006), 88-106, AG Grauwacke, *Autonome in Bewegung: Aus den ersten 23 Jahren* (Berlin: Assoziation A, 2003), 34-86, Stefan Aust and Sabine Rosenblatt, eds., *Hausbesetzer: Wofür sie kämpfen, wie sie leben und wie sie leben wollen* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1981).

⁴⁹ Hanspeter Kriesi, *Die Züricher Bewegung: Bilder, Interaktionen, Zusammenhänge* (Frankfurt a.M.: Campus Verlag, 1984), Heinz Nigg, ed., *Wir wollen alles, und zwar subito! Die Achtziger Jugendunruhen in der Schweiz und ihre Folgen* (Zurich: Limmat Verlag, 2001), Thomas Stahel, *Wo-Wo-Wonige: Stadt- und wohnpolitische Bewegungen in Zürich nach 1968* (Zurich: Paranoia City, 2006), Sophie von Vogel and Lars Schultze-Kossack, eds., *Zür(e)ich brennt* (Zurich: Europa Verlag AG, 2010), Mischa Brutschin, “Züri brännt,” in *Häuserkampf I: Wir wollen alles - Der Beginn einer Bewegung* (Hamburg: Laika Verlag, 2012), 175-204.

⁵⁰ On Freiburg, see Volkhart Schönberg, “Freiburg: Bewegungen in den besetzten Häusern,” in *Häuserkampf I: Wir wollen alles - Der Beginn einer Bewegung* (Hamburg: Laika Verlag, 2012).

⁵¹ Personal conversation with G.U., Berlin, October 2011, and personal conversation with U.W. and G.W., Berlin, November 2011.

⁵² For a sophisticated discussion of events as transformative moments, see William H. Jr. Sewell, *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 197-224, Robin Wagner-Pacifici, *What Is An Event?* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017).

⁵³ See Joachim C. Häberlen, “Sekunden der Freiheit: Zum Verhältnis von Gefühlen, Macht und Zeit in Ausnahmesituationen am Beispiel der Revolte 1980/81 in Berlin,” in *Ausnahmezustände: Entgrenzungen und Regulierungen in Europa während des Kalten Krieges*, ed. Dirk Schumann and Cornelia Rauh (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2015), 195-213. See now Lukas J. Hezel, “‘Was gibt es zu verlieren, wo es kein Morgen gibt?’ Chronopolitik und Radikalisierung in der Jugendrevolte 1980/81 und bei den Autonomen,” in *Zeitenwandel: Transformationen geschichtlicher Zeitlichkeit nach dem Boom*, ed. Fernando Esposito (Göttingen: Vadenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 119-152. It should be noted that Hezel uses the same sources that I use,

but without referring to my previous work which has addressed questions of temporality and emotions in the revolts of 1980/81.

⁵⁴ Anon., “Anarchie als Minimalforderung,” in *radikal: Lieber explosives Chaos als kontrollierte Hochspannung* 97, August 1981, 10.

⁵⁵ See Anders, “Wohnraum,” 494-495, Sebastian Haunss, *Identität in Bewegung: Prozesse kollektiver Identität bei den Autonomen und in der Schwulenbewegung* (Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2004), 122.

⁵⁶ K. Ätzer, “Rhythmuswechsel, oder: Wenn wir alle unser revolutionäres Über-Ich mitbringen, dann sind wir schon doppelt so viele,” *radikal: Zeitung für den reißenden Absatz* 106, July 1982, 8-9.

⁵⁷ Tomas Lecorte, *Wir tanzen bis zum Ende: die Geschichte eines Autonomen* (Hamburg: Galgenberg, 1992), 81.

⁵⁸ Anon., “Eingemachtes,” in *radikal: Zeitung für unbeschwerte Stunden* 103, April 1982, 6.

⁵⁹ Agentur BILWET, *Bewegungslehre: Botschaften aus einer autonomen Wirklichkeit* (Berlin: Edition ID-Archiv, 1991).

⁶⁰ Ibid., 9-10.

⁶¹ Ibid., 168.

⁶² Ibid., 42.

⁶³ Sewell, *Logics of History*, 7.

⁶⁴ Anon., “Definition der Subrealisten,” *Revolte* 15/16, June 1976, 53-55.

⁶⁵ Herbert Röttgen and Florian Rabe, *Vulkantänze: Linke und alternative Ausgänge* (Munich: Trikont-Verlag, 1978), 113-114.

⁶⁶ Rädli, “[Title Illegible.]”

⁶⁷ Anon., “RZ und radi – kritisch betrachtet,” *radikal: Zeitung für Brigaden nach Europa*, 123, December 1983, 15.

⁶⁸ Jürgen, “Kreuzberg lebt,” *taž* 51, 15 December 1980, 5, found in *Ordner Häuserkämpfe*, Papiertiger Archiv Berlin.) See also Härlin, “Von Haus zu Haus,” 1-5.

⁶⁹ “SPIEGEL-Gespräch: Tränengas ist der dritte Bildungsweg,” *Der Spiegel* 43, 24 October 1983, 115-116.

⁷⁰ Die Kämpfer der aufbrechenden sado-marxistischen Internationale, “Nicht stehenbleiben,” Pamphlet, June 1982, found in *Ordner Anti-Nato Bewegung*, Papiertiger Archiv Berlin.

⁷¹ Migro, “Römerberg: Ein besetztes Haus wurde geräumt,” *Vollautonom* 200, [n.d., January / February 1981], 6-7.

⁷² See for example Dr. Seltsam, “Käseklaus und Bombenbau,” *radikal: Zeitung für Jagd aus Leidenschaft* 104, May 1982, 11.

⁷³ Personal conversations with G.U., Berlin, October 2011, and with U.W. and G.W., Berlin, November 2011. See also Grauwacke, *Autonome*, 51. For a personal account, see also Johann Christoph Wartenberg, *Kreuzberg, K36, Leben in (der) Bewegung: Kreuzberg inside bis zum Fall der Mauer* (Bockenem: Lühmann, 2003).

⁷⁴ Anon., “Liebe zur Stadt,” *Traumstadt* 7, [n.d., probably summer 1981], 5-11. On the lure of West Berlin as a site of protesting from the late 1960s to the early 1980s, see also Belinda Davis, “The City as Theater of Protest: West Berlin and West Germany, 1962-1983,” in *The Spaces of the Modern City: Imaginaries, Politics and Everyday Life*, ed. Gyan Prakash and Kevin M. Kruse (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 247-275.

⁷⁵ On official expert perspectives on the revolt, see Jake Smith, “Apathy, Subversion, and the Network Sublime: Envisioning Youth Unrest in West Germany, 1980-87,” in *A European*

Youth Revolt: European Perspectives on Youth Protest and Social Movements in the 1980s, ed. Knud Andresen and Bart van der Steen (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 231-242.

⁷⁶ See “Der Tod des politischen Subjekts: Interview mit Baudrillard,” *radikal: Fachblatt für alles, was Terroristen Spaß macht* 126/127, March / April 1984, 14-19. The *radikal* interviewer claimed to cite Foucault, but I have not been able to locate the actual quote in Foucault’s work.

⁷⁷ See only the classical study by Detlev Peukert, *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993).

⁷⁸ For such a perspective, see Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, Lutz Raphael, and Thomas Schlemmer, eds., *Vorgeschichte der Gegenwart: Dimensionen des Strukturbruchs nach dem Boom* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), Konrad H. Jarausch, “Verkannter Strukturwandel: Die siebziger Jahre als Vorgeschichte der Probleme der Gegenwart,” in *Das Ende der Zuversicht? Die siebziger Jahre als Geschichte*, ed. Konrad H. Jarausch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 9-28.